UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,260	06/20/2005	Laurence Paris	2004-219	8662
27569 PAUL AND PA	7590 09/12/200 <b>\U</b> L	EXAMINER		
2000 MARKET SUITE 2900	Γ STREET	SIMMONS WILLIS, TRACEY A		
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4161	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@PAULANDPAUL.COM claire@paulandpaul.com fpanna@paulandpaul.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comment	10/511,260	PARIS, LAURENCE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	TRACEY SIMMONS WILLIS	4161				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
·—	, <del></del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
closed in accordance with the practice under Lx parte Quayle, 1930 C.D. 11, 400 C.C. 210.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa	te				

# DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-39, drawn to a liquid composition.

Group II, claim(s) 40, drawn to a manufacturing method of liquid compositions.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: U.S. Patent 5,330,759 (Pagay et al) teaches of formation of a soft capsule by mixing and spraying with air at a temperature in range of 60 °C [column 3, lines 14-20].

# Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

### Group I:

a. physical modification of the content of the capsule by inverted latexes and/or lipophilic hydrocolloid [claim 3] or by means of gellification and/or formation of a porous lattice [claim 4]

- b. release kinetics modulated by introduction or not of hydrophilic plasticizers, etc. [claim 6], is a function or not of pH [claim 7], or is a function of digestive enzymes [claim 8]
- c. lipophilic hydrocolloid solutions constituted of synthetic polymers and/or natural derivatives [claim 18]

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

- a. Choice of physical modification of the content of the capsule by inverted latexes and/or lipophilic hydrocolloid in claim 3 will directly affect claims 18-21.
- b. Choice of release kinetics modulated by introduction or not of hydrophilic plasticizers, etc. in claim 6 will directly affect claims 22-32.
- c. Choice of synthetic polymers and/or natural derivatives for lipophilic hydrocolloid solutions in claim 18 will directly affect claims 33-36.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-17, and 37-39.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: U.S. Patent 7,056,531 (Swenson et al) teaches of sustained release formulations for orally administered substances comprising maltodextrin and cellulose in which a gel is formed upon ingestion [column 2, line 54], U.S. Patent 4,678,516 (Alderman et al) teaches of sustained release compositions with HPMC as a plasticizer [column 3, lines 1-2], and U.S. Patent 4,704,285 (Alderman) teaches of sustained release compositions comprising hydroxypropyl cellulose ethers (title).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected

process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRACEY SIMMONS-WILLIS whose telephone number is (571)270-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays from 8:30 am to 12:30 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,260

Art Unit: 4161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Page 6

supervisor, Patrick Nolan, can be reached at (571)272-0847. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. S.W./

Examiner, Art Unit 4161

/Patrick J. Nolan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4161